

INDIANA BOARD OF TAX REVIEW
Small Claims
Final Determination
Findings and Conclusions

Petition: 45-003-13-1-5-00318-16
Petitioner: James Nowacki
Respondent: Lake County Assessor
Parcel: 45-08-18-352-022.000-003
Assessment Year: 2013

The Indiana Board of Tax Review (“Board”) issues this determination, finding and concluding as follows:

Procedural History

1. Petitioner initiated his 2013 appeal with the Lake County Property Tax Assessment Board of Appeals (“PTABOA”). The PTABOA issued notice of its final determination on November 19, 2015. On January 6, 2016, Petitioner filed a Form 131 petition with the Board.
2. Petitioner elected to have the appeal heard under the Board’s small claims procedures. Respondent did not elect to have the appeal removed from those procedures.
3. Ellen Yuhan, the Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) appointed by the Board, held the administrative hearing on April 23, 2018. Neither the ALJ nor the Board inspected the property.
4. James Nowacki, Petitioner, was sworn and testified. Robert W. Metz and Gordona Bauhan, Lake County Hearing Officers, were sworn as witnesses for Respondent.

Facts

5. The subject property is a vacant residential lot located at 4301 W. 27th Place in Gary.
6. For 2013, the assessed value was \$2,800.
7. Petitioner requested an assessed value of \$1,800.

Record

8. The official record contains the following:

a. A digital recording of the hearing,

b. Exhibits:

Petitioner Exhibit 1:	Property record card (“PRC”) for the subject property,
Respondent Exhibit 1:	Real Property Maintenance Report for 2012 pay 2013,
Respondent Exhibit 2:	Real Property Maintenance Report for 2013 pay 2014,
Respondent Exhibit 3:	GIS map,
Respondent Exhibit 4:	PRC for the subject property,
Board Exhibit A:	Form 131 petition and attachments,
Board Exhibit B:	Notice of hearing,
Board Exhibit C:	Hearing sign-in sheet,

c. These Findings and Conclusions.

Burden

9. Generally, a taxpayer seeking review of an assessing official’s determination has the burden of proving that a property’s assessment is wrong and what the correct assessment should be. *See Meridian Towers East & West v. Washington Twp. Assessor*, 805 N.E.2d 475, 478 (Ind. Tax Ct. 2003); *see also Clark v. State Bd. of Tax Comm’rs*, 694 N.E.2d 1230 (Ind. Tax Ct. 1998). A burden-shifting statute creates two exceptions to that rule.
10. First, Ind. Code § 6-1.1-15-17.2 “applies to any review or appeal of an assessment under this chapter if the assessment that is the subject of the review or appeal is an increase of more than five percent (5%) over the assessment for the same property for the prior tax year.” Ind. Code § 6-1.1-15-17.2(a). “Under this section, the county assessor or township assessor making the assessment has the burden of proving that the assessment is correct in any review or appeal under this chapter and in any appeals taken to the Indiana board of tax review or to the Indiana tax court.” Ind. Code § 6-1.1-15-17.2(b).
11. Second, Ind. Code § 6-1.1-15-17.2(d) “applies to real property for which the gross assessed value of the real property was reduced by the assessing official or reviewing authority in an appeal conducted under Ind. Code § 6-1.1-15,” except where the property was valued using the income capitalization approach in the appeal. Under subsection (d), “if the gross assessed value of real property for an assessment date that follows the latest assessment date that was the subject of an appeal described in this subsection is increased above the gross assessed value of the real property for the latest assessment date covered by the appeal, regardless of the amount of the increase, the county assessor or township assessor (if any) making the assessment has the burden of proving that the assessment is correct.” Ind. Code § 6-1.1-15-17.2(d).

12. These provisions may not apply if there was a change in improvements, zoning, or use. Ind. Code § 6-1.1-15-17.2(c).
13. The assessed value did not change from 2012 to 2013. Petitioner, therefore, has the burden of proof.

Summary of Parties' Contentions

14. Petitioner's case:
 - a. Petitioner acquired the property for \$58 at auction in 2009. He contends the auction was well attended by eligible and capable bidders. Prior to Petitioner's acquisition, he claims the property had been churning through the tax sale system for 30 years. He contends that in any other market situation, a seller would ordinarily lower the price. He claims, however, such is not the case with Respondent. *Nowacki testimony; Pet'r Ex. 1.*
 - b. Petitioner contends the subject property's value is affected by many external factors. For example, there is zero interest in developing in the area because of the blighted conditions and the high crime rate. The loss of population in the city also has a negative effect. *Nowacki testimony.*
 - c. Petitioner contends the property is not worth the assessed valuation. While he acknowledges there has been a decrease to the present assessed value of \$2,400, it is still over-assessed. He is, however, willing to compromise and accept \$1,800 as the assessed value. *Nowacki testimony.*
 - d. Petitioner contends this appeal has taken five years to go through the process. He contends the lengthy process is part of a strategy to run the population out of Gary and create more dilapidated and abandoned buildings. This creates more work for the contractors who demolish the buildings and decimates the city's tax base. *Nowacki testimony.*

15. Respondent's case:

Respondent contends Petitioner failed to present any probative evidence to support his requested value. *Bauhan testimony.*

ANALYSIS

16. Petitioner failed to make a prima facie case for a reduction in the assessed value. The Board reached this decision for the following reasons:
 - a. Indiana assesses real property based on its true tax value, which the Department

- of Local Government Finance (“DLGF”) has defined as the property’s market value-in-use. Ind. Code § 6-1.1-31-6(c); 2011 REAL PROPERTY ASSESSMENT MANUAL at 2 (incorporated by reference at 50 IAC 2.4-1-2). To show a property’s market value-in-use, a party may offer evidence that is consistent with the DLGF’s definition of true tax value. A market value-in-use appraisal prepared according to the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (“USPAP”) will often be probative. *Kooshtard Property VI v. White River Township Assessor*, 836 N.E.2d 501, 506 (Ind. Tax Ct. 2005). Parties may also offer evidence of actual construction costs, sales information for the property under appeal, sale or assessment information for comparable properties, and any other information compiled according to generally accepted appraisal principles. *See Id.*; *see also*, I.C. § 6-1.1-15-18 (allowing parties to offer evidence of comparable properties’ assessments to determine an appealed property’s market value-in-use).
- b. Regardless of the method used to prove a property’s true tax value, a party must explain how its evidence relates to the subject property’s market value-in-use as of the relevant valuation date. *O’Donnell v. Dep’t of Local Gov’t Fin.*, 854 N.E.2d 90, 95 (Ind. Tax Ct. 2006); *see also Long v. Wayne Twp. Assessor*, 821 N.E.2d 466, 471 (Ind. Tax Ct. 2005). The valuation date for the 2013 assessment date at issue in this appeal was March 1, 2013. Ind. Code § 6-1.1-4-4.5(f); 50 IAC 27-5-2(c).
- c. Petitioner contends the property should be assessed at \$1,800. Petitioner presented no evidence to support that value. Statements that are unsupported by probative evidence are conclusory and of no value to the Board in making its determination. *Whitley Products, Inc. v. State Bd. of Tax Comm’rs*, 704 N.E.2d 1113, 1118 (Ind. Tax Ct. 1998).
- d. Petitioner contends the property suffers from negative exterior factors, in other words, external obsolescence. External obsolescence is caused by an influence outside of a property’s boundaries that has a negative influence on the property’s value. *Clark v. Dep’t of Local Gov’t Fin.*, 77 N.E.2d 1277 (Ind. Tax Ct. 2002). To receive an adjustment for obsolescence, a property owner must identify the causes of obsolescence present and quantify the amount of obsolescence it believes should be applied to his property. *Clark v. State Bd. of Tax Comm’rs*, 694 N.E.2d 1230, 1241 (Ind. Tax Ct. 1998). While Petitioner identified some issues that might be the cause of such obsolescence, he failed to quantify the amount of obsolescence.
- e. Petitioner complains the appeal process has taken five years. But, pursuant to Ind. Code § 6-1.1-15-1(o), Petitioner had the right to appeal directly to the Board if the petition was not heard by the PTABOA within 180 days as required by Ind. Code § 6-1.1-15-1(k). Therefore, the alleged lengthy appeal process was due, in part, to Petitioner’s own inaction.
- f. Petitioner had the burden of proof and failed to make a prima facie case for changing the assessment. Where a petitioner has not supported its claim with probative evidence, the respondent’s duty to support the assessment with substantial evidence is

not triggered. *Lacy Diversified Indus. v. Dep't of Local Gov't Fin.*, 799 N.E.2d 1215, 1221-1222 (Ind. Tax Ct. 2003).

CONCLUSION

17. Petitioner failed to establish a prima facie case that the 2013 assessed value is incorrect. Consequently, the Board finds for Respondent.

FINAL DETERMINATION

In accordance with the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, the Board determines the 2013 value should not be changed.

ISSUED: July 13, 2018

Chairman, Indiana Board of Tax Review

Commissioner, Indiana Board of Tax Review

Commissioner, Indiana Board of Tax Review

- APPEAL RIGHTS -

You may petition for judicial review of this final determination under the provisions of Indiana Code § 6-1.1-15-5 and the Indiana Tax Court's rules. To initiate a proceeding for judicial review you must take the action required not later than forty-five (45) days after the date of this notice. The Indiana Code is available on the Internet at <<http://www.in.gov/legislative/ic/code>>. The Indiana Tax Court's rules are available at <<http://www.in.gov/judiciary/rules/tax/index.html>>.